



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,898	01/23/2004	Patrick M. Baudisch	MSFT121882	7772
26389 7590 08/15/2007 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER WIENER, ERIC A	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,898

Applicant(s)

BAUDISCH ET AL.

Examiner

Eric A. Wiener

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 7 - 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 7 - 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on 6/8/2007.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 20 are pending in the case. Claims 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, and 17 – 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 20 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,661,502 issued to Xuejiang Cheng.

As per independent claims 1 and 8, Xuejiang Cheng discloses *a method for enhancing a mouse cursor displayed on a computer display and a computer readable medium* (column 3, lines 15 – 24) *for carrying out said method, in which said method comprises:*

- *obtaining the current mouse cursor speed* (column 4, lines 20 – 37);
- *determining whether the current mouse cursor speed exceeds a predetermined threshold* (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 10); *and if so:*

Art Unit: 2179

- *generating a mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor positions (column 4, lines 15 – 54);*
- *determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 9); and*
- *displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the current mouse cursor location (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 9), wherein, as can be seen in Fig. 3, when the speed is fast such as the lines of 302, additional cursor image locations are present in line 302a corresponding to the enhanced mouse track, because the x's representing the enhanced mouse cursor images outnumber the o's representing the regular mouse cursor images.*

As per independent claim 14, *Xuejiang Cheng discloses a method for enhancing a mouse cursor displayed on a computer display comprising:*

- *obtaining mouse cursor information relating to the mouse cursor during the mouse cursor's display cycle (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 37), the mouse cursor information including the mouse cursor's current speed (column 4, lines 20 – 37);*
- *generating a mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor positions (column 4, lines 15 – 54);*
- *determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 9); and*

- *displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the current mouse cursor location* (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 9), wherein, as can be seen in Fig. 3, when the speed is fast such as the lines of 302, additional cursor image locations are present in line 302a corresponding to the enhanced mouse track, because the x's representing the enhanced mouse cursor images outnumber the o's representing the regular mouse cursor images.

As per claim 2, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Xuejiang Cheng further discloses *displaying the enhanced mouse cursor image on the computer display* (column 4, lines 20 – 54), wherein the output of coordinates corresponds to displaying the mouse cursor image on a computer display at those coordinates.

As per claims 7, 13, and 20, and taking into account the rejection of claims 2, 8, and 14, respectively, Xuejiang Cheng further discloses that *the at least one additional cursor location is distributed along the mouse path in a non-linear progression according to the mouse cursor speed* (column 5, lines 7 – 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,661,502 issued to Xuejiang Cheng in view of JP 05073257 A issued to Kensuke.

As per claims 3, 9, and 16, Xuejiang Cheng discloses the computer-readable medium and methods of claims 2, 8, and 14, respectively. Xuejiang Cheng does not explicitly disclose that generating the enhanced mouse cursor comprises sizing the mouse cursor image as a function of the current mouse cursor speed.

However, in an analogous art, Kensuke discloses that generating an enhanced mouse cursor comprises *sizing the mouse cursor image as a function of the current mouse cursor speed* ([0009]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teaching of Kensuke into the method and computer-readable medium of Xuejiang Cheng to develop a method and computer-readable medium for sizing a mouse cursor in a continuous scale and immediate manner according to the current mouse cursor speed. The motivation to combine is obvious in that both inventions are for enhancing a mouse cursor. The invention of Xuejiang Cheng intends to improve use by allowing the mouse cursor to be more smoothly displayed, thus allowing a user to more easily see where the cursor is moving. Likewise, Kensuke intends to also make a cursor easier to visually recognize through smoothly changing the size of the cursor.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,661,502 issued to Xuejiang Cheng in view of "Animation: From Cartoons to the User Interface" by Bay-Wei Chang.

As per claim 11, Xuejiang Cheng discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 8. Xuejiang Cheng does not explicitly disclose generating a motion-blur effect for the mouse cursor according to the current mouse cursor speed along the generated mouse path.

However, in an analogous art, Bay-Wei Chang discloses *generating a motion-blur effect for the mouse cursor according to the current mouse cursor speed along the generated mouse path* (pages 47 – 49, “2.1.1 Solidity: Motion blur”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teaching of Bay-Wei Chang into the computer-readable medium of Xuejiang Cheng to develop a computer-readable medium for generating an enhanced mouse cursor comprising generating a motion-blur effect for the mouse cursor according to the current mouse cursor speed along a determined generated mouse path. The motivation to combine is obvious in that both the invention of Xuejiang Cheng and the teaching of Bay-Wei Chang are for enhancing a mouse cursor. The invention of Xuejiang Cheng intends to improve use by allowing the mouse cursor to be more smoothly displayed, thus allowing a user to more easily see where the cursor is moving. Likewise, as disclosed in the last three lines of page 53, column 1 of “Animation: From Cartoons to the User Interface,” the teaching of Bay-Wei Chang intends to reduce the time it takes a user to visually comprehend an action.

8. It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-

33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. The cited documents represent the general state of the art.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/8/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. In response to applicant's arguments that Cheng fails to disclose features of claim 1, please see the rejection of claim 1 *supra*. In addition, referring to the lines of 302 in Fig. 3, and taking the start point as "a previous position" and the end point as "the current position," it can clearly be seen that at least one additional cursor location is determined for the corrected mouse track, because there are more x's within line 302a than there are o's within line 302b between said current position and said previous position. Therefore, Cheng does disclose all limitations of claim 1.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric A. Wiener whose telephone number is 571-270-1401. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eric Wiener
Patent Examiner
A.U. 2179


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER